UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,038	04/30/2001	Brian T. Murren	GE1-008US	5210

21718   7590   03/14/2007

LEE & HAYES PLLC
SUITE 500
421 W RIVERSIDE
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/14/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhpto@leehayes.com

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	09/847,038	MURREN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) _CESAR B. PAULA_.   (3)_____.

(2) _NATHAN T GREBASCH_.   (4)_____.

Date of Interview: _06 March 2007_. ·

Type: a)☒ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
       c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant   2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☒ No.
   If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _1-5,7-10,12,14-27,29,30 and 34-37_.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.   g)☒ was not reached.   h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _DISCUSSED DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PRIOR ART OF RECORD AND PROPOSED AMENDED CLAIMS._.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	
	Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record
A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews
Paragraph (b)
In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.
All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

———

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:
- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:
1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
2) an identification of the claims discussed,
3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
   (The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

lee&hayes

Fax Cover Sheet

DATE: 03/05/2007

TO: EXAMINER CESAR PAULA

ART UNIT 2178

FAX # 571-273-4128

FROM: Nathan T Grebasch

RE: S/N 09/847,038 (Confirmation # 5210)

NUMBER OF PAGES (including cover sheet): *12*

PROPOSED

Amendment

421 west riverside avenue, suite 500, spokane, washington 99201 www.leehayes.com

lee & hayes pllc, intellectual property law

303·539·0265 / fax 303·539·0270 DENVER

206·315·4001 / fax 206·315·4004 SEATTLE

509·324·9256 / fax 509·323·8979 SPOKANE

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application Serial No. 09/847,038

Filing Date .... April 30, 2001

Inventor.. Brian T. Murren et al.

Group Art Unit 2178

Examiner .... Paula, Cesar B.

Attorney's Docket No. GE1-008US

Confirmation No...5210

Title: Automatic Identification Of Form Contents

PROPOSED PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT

Not for entry.

A **Claim Amendment** begins on page 2 of this paper; and

Remarks begin on page 11 of this paper.

1

CLAIM LISTING

1.   (Currently Amended)   A method implemented in a computer, the method comprising:

receiving an indication of a desired form to be ~~used~~ generated for data input;

automatically identifying one or more data input fields to be included on the desired form, the automatically identifying including:

identifying one or more interactions associated with a business logic, wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via a form resulting from the desired form, ~~and~~ wherein each interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions to process the request submitted via the form resulting from the desired form; and

identifying, in the one or more interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interactions elsewhere; and

generating, after automatically identifying the one or more data input fields, a form definition including the automatically identified one or more data input fields.

2.   (Original)   A method as recited in claim 1, further comprising automatically identifying, for each of the one or more data input fields, one or more restrictions to be imposed on the data subsequently input via the data field.

2

3.   (Currently Amended) A method as recited in claim 2, wherein automatically identifying the one or more restrictions comprises requesting, from a business logic, an identification of the one or more restrictions and receiving, from the business logic, the identification of the one or more restrictions, and wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via the form.

4.   (Original) A method as recited in claim 2, wherein automatically identifying the one or more restrictions comprises:

identifying one or more interactions associated with a business logic, wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via the form, and wherein each interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions to process the request; and

identifying, in the one or more interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interactions elsewhere.

5.   (Original) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein automatically identifying the one or more data input fields comprises requesting, from a business logic, an identification of the one or more data input fields, wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via the form.

6.   (Canceled).

7.   (Original) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein each of the one or more data input fields comprises a user input field.

8.   (Original) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the automatically identifying comprises communicating with a business logic to identify the one or more data input fields.

3

9. (Original) A method as recited in claim 8, wherein the business logic comprises a plurality of interactions to process requests, and wherein the indication comprises an identification of one of the plurality of interactions.

10. (Currently Amended) A method comprising:

automatically identifying one or more restrictions associated with a data input field, the automatically identifying including:

communicating with a business logic to identify the one or more restrictions, wherein the business logic processes requests which are subsequently submitted via ~~the~~ a generated form, the communicating including identifying one or more processing interactions ~~associated with the business logic~~, wherein each processing interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions to process the request, and identifying, in the one or more processing interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more processing interactions elsewhere; and

using, after automatically identifying the one or more restrictions, the one or more restrictions and the field to generate a text markup language form definition for use with the generated form.

11. (Canceled).

12. (Previously presented) A method as recited in claim 10, wherein the communicating further comprises requesting, from the business logic, an identification of the one or more restrictions and receiving, from the business logic, the identification of the one or more restrictions.

13. (Canceled).

4

14.   (Original) A method as recited in claim 10, further comprising:

automatically identifying the data input field to be included in the text markup language form.

15.   (Currently Amended) A method as recited in claim 14, wherein automatically identifying the data input field comprises 'requesting, from a business logic, an identification of the data input field, wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via the generated form.

16.   (Currently Amended) A method as recited in claim 14, wherein automatically identifying the data input field comprises:

identifying one or more processing interactions associated with the business logic, wherein each processing interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions to process the request; and

identifying, in the one or more processing interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more processing interactions elsewhere.

17.   (Original) A method as recited in claim 14, wherein automatically identifying the one or more restrictions comprises automatically identifying that a data input to the automatically identified data input field is required when submitting the form.

18.   (Original) A method as recited in claim 10, wherein the data input field is for user input of data.

5

19.   (Original) A method as recited in claim 10, wherein the data input field comprises one of the following fields: a text input field, a password input field, a checkbox field, a button field, a radio button field, a drop down field, and one or more values of a selection field.

20.   (Currently Amended) One or more computer-readable media comprising computer-executable instructions that, when executed, direct a processor to perform acts comprising:

determining one or more attributes that are used by a business logic but not obtained by the business logic elsewhere, wherein the determining is based at least in part on one or more processing interactions associated with the business logic, each of the one or more processing interactions being associated with a request to be processed by the business logic and including one or more command definitions to process the request;

using, after determining the one or more attributes, each of the one or more attributes to define a field of a form definition, the field being used to obtain data input into a form to be generated; and

including validation code in the form definition associated with the defined one or more fields, wherein the validation code, when executed, verifies that data is input to the defined field.

21.   (Original) One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 20, wherein the data input comprises data input by a user.

22.   (Original) One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 20, wherein the computer-executable instructions further direct the processor to perform acts including:

identifying additional restrictions to be imposed on data input via the field; and

6

including additional validation code corresponding to the additional restrictions and associated with the defined one or more fields, wherein the additional validation code, when executed by another processor, causes the other processor to verify that the additional restrictions are satisfied.

23.   (Original) One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 22, wherein identifying additional restrictions comprises requesting, from the business logic, an identification of the additional restrictions and receiving, from the business logic, the identification of the additional restrictions.

24.   (Original) One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 20, wherein the computer-executable instructions further direct the processor to perform acts including:

identifying restrictions to be imposed on data input via one or more additional fields on the form; and

including additional validation code corresponding to the additional restrictions and associated with the one or more additional fields, wherein the additional validation code, when executed by another processor, causes the other processor to verify that the additional restrictions are satisfied.

25.   (Original) One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 20, wherein the computer-executable instructions further direct the processor to perform acts including:

identifying additional restrictions to be imposed on data input via the field; and

including additional validation code corresponding to the additional restrictions and associated with the defined one or more fields, wherein the additional validation code, when executed by the processor, causes the processor to verify that the additional restrictions are satisfied.

7

26.   (Currently Amended) A system comprising:

a tag library to store validation code that, when included in a form definition and executed from the form definition, verifies that an input to an associated data input field of ~~the~~ a generated form defined by the form definition satisfies one or more restrictions; and

a form processor configured to automatically identify one or more restrictions to be associated with a data input field of the generated form, and further configured to add to the form definition, after the automatic identification of the one or more restrictions, validation code from the tag library to verify that a subsequent input to the data field satisfies the one or more automatically identified restrictions, wherein the form processor is configured to automatically identify the one or more restrictions by:

identifying one or more processing interactions associated with a business logic, wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via the generated form; and

identifying, in the one or more interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more interactions elsewhere.

27.   (Original) A system as recited in claim 26, wherein the form processor includes an attribute restriction identification module configured to automatically identify the one or more restrictions, and a tag replacement module to automatically include, in the form definition, the validation code to verify that the subsequent input to the data field satisfies the one or more automatically identified restrictions.

28.   (Canceled).

8

29.   (Original)   A system as recited in claim 26, wherein the form processor is further configured to:

identify one or more processing interactions associated with a business logic, wherein the business logic processes requests subsequently submitted via the generated form;

identify, in the one or more processing interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more processing interactions elsewhere; and

identify one or more additional data input fields to be included in the generated form based at least in part on the identification of the one or more attributes not obtained by one or more processing interactions elsewhere.

30.   (Original)   A system as recited in claim 26, wherein the input is a user input.

31.   (Canceled).

32.   (Canceled).

33.   (Canceled).

34.   (Previously presented)   An architecture comprising:

a business logic layer to process requests received from a client; and

an execution environment layer via which a form processing module can communicate with the business logic layer, wherein the form processing module obtains, from the business logic layer, an indication of one or more restrictions on data input to a form for a request to be subsequently processed by the business logic layer, and adds the one or more restrictions to a form definition for the form.

9

35.   (Original)   An architecture as recited in claim 34, wherein the data input field is for user input of data.

36.   (Currently Amended)   A method comprising:

accessing a business logic to identify one or more processing interactions associated with the business logic, wherein each processing interaction is associated with a request and includes one or more command definitions for the business logic to process the request;

identifying, in the one or more processing interactions, one or more attributes that are not obtained by the one or more processing interactions elsewhere; and

indicating that the one or more identified attributes are to be obtained via a data input field on a form to be generated, and further indicating that an input for the data input field is needed when submitting the form.

37.   (Original)   A method as recited in claim 36, wherein the input comprises a user input.

10

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12, 14-27, 29, 30, 34-37 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 10, 15, 16, 20, 26 and 37 are amended. Removal of the pending rejection is requested. Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification and drawings as filed. In particular, support may be found at Page 8, line 11 through Page 9, line 2; Page 59, line 24 through Page 60, line 11; and Page 61, line 25 through Page 62 line 25.

The art of record fails to teach the recited features. In particular, the Hitchcock reference does not disclose, at least, form generation as Hitchcock is directed to filling in an already existing form.

The claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: _____   By: _____

Nathan T. Grebasch
Reg. No. 48,600
(509) 324-9256 x228

11